

THE
MISTAKES
Of a CLERGYMAN

Corrected by a

WEAVER.

OR, AN

ANSWER to Mr S—T's Accusatory
Appendix, affixed to a copy of Mr
Brown's Exposition of the Romans:

IN A

LETTER to the said Mr S—t, in Vindication of
Mr Brown.

By R. L——E, Weaver.

1 Sam. xvii. 40—45. *Thou comest—with a spear and
with a shield; but I come to thee in the name of the
Lord of hosts, the God of the armies of Israel, whom
thou hast defied.*

2 Pet. ii. 16. *But was rebuked for his iniquity; the
dumb ass speaking with man's voice, forbade the mad-
ness of the prophet.*

Rev. xii. 10. *The accuser of our brethren is (or will be)
cast down.*————

EDINBURGH:

Printed in the Year MDCCCLXX.

John Smith bought
this book.

MISTAKES in this **COMMENTARY**, partly owing, perhaps, to the vitiations committed upon the manuscript,—in order to make the worthy Author seem to support some low sectarian plan.

1st, In his introduction, he allows, and very justly, that the reason why Jews and Gentiles could not be justified by the works of the law of Moses, was, that they had not fulfilled the obligations of that law;—*they were all under sin*—But in his explication, (iii. 19—31.) he forgets this, and places his argument on a different foot,—as if obedience to the laws of God even under the gospel were of no avail, contrary to chap. vi. and viii.

2dly, In his explication of chap. v. verse 18. he contradicts himself, and, in order to make good a favourite point, artfully shifts the case in hand, and fights with a man of straw.—Thus the weak reader is betrayed.——

3dly, Upon the first five chapters, he applies the reasoning of the apostle to the present times; the apostle himself expressly confines it to the first ages, (iii. 26.) *at this time*, says he.

4thly, Tho' he sometimes takes notice of the original controversy upon which it was wrote, (*Acts* xv. 1.) yet he generally loses sight of it in his comment, and runs into the Antinomian plan, which is the worst of all mistakes in Christianity, and of akin to that, *Jude* 4. *Rom.* vi. 1. *Gal.* ii. 19.

5thly, He almost always substitutes the terms of admission into the Christian covenant at that time, for the terms of acceptance to salvation under the gospel, and within the pale of the Christian church;—and thus makes the apostle contradict himself, (iii. 28. and vi. 22. and viii. 1.)

6thly, In his explication of the seventh chapter, he forgets

forgets the thread of the apostle's reasoning, and follows the admirers of Augustine the monk; and pays no regard to the explications of the orthodox, and others of the church, for the first 400 years after Christ,—and in this he agrees with all the Popish commentators.—To this may be applied *Luke v. 39.*

7thly, He makes no distinction between the purpose or predestination of God, to call the Gentiles into the Christian church, and their actual election at their acceptance of the call, stiled the election of grace; in opposition to the old election of the Israelites, who were chosen and beloved for their father's sakes.

8thly, Therefore he applies to individuals, what is designed by the apostle of large bodies and societies of men, chap. viii. 29.—and chap. ix. x. xi.

9thly, He takes no notice that the word translated righteousness and justification, in the original, is the same, and therefore leads the English reader into a gross mistake through the iii. iv. and v. chapters, as if by righteousness, was meant the foundation of justification;—whereas, in fact, it is meant of justification itself, which consisted in the remission of their sins that were past, and their being received into the church and covenant of God upon the gospel plan.—There is only one exception from this (v. 18.) where the antithesis evidently determines the sense.—

10thly, Upon account of all which mistakes, he raises observations from many passages, which are quite foreign to the apostle's meaning, and in some places, scarcely consistent with the faith and doctrines of the gospel, once delivered to the saints.

11thly, In short, the whole commentary in the doctrinal part of the epistle, is not upon the original plan of the gospel, as preached by St Paul to the Gentiles, in whose interest he received his commission, and whose cause he warmly espouses in all his epistles, (*Rom. xvi. 25, 26. Gal. iii. 14,—29. Eph. ii. 12—20. and Eph. iii. 1—11.) Col. i. 21—28. and ii. 11—14. 2 Tim. ii. 9, 10.*

A LETTER in answer to the foregoing pretended MISTAKES.

S I R,

I HAVE seen your mistakes, which you affixed to the end of Mr Brown's book upon the epistle to the Romans; and as I recommended the book both to you and others, and promised to answer for its soundness, I reckon myself the more concerned to take notice of it: And, as I approve and commend ingenuity and freedom in any man, altho' his principles should not be very good, so I commend you for your ingenuity, in so far as you have shewed your real sentiments; only I wish you had been more particular: and I hope, you will not be offended, if I be free and ingenuous also.

You say, That these mistakes are, "partly owing, perhaps, to the vitiations committed upon the manuscript, in order to make the worthy author seem to support some low sectarian plan." Sir, I should regret that you did not read the preface to the reader, if it were not for what I see you have wrote at the foot of it, *viz.* "This preface was wrote by a Papist, with a view to deceive the people, &c." (Perhaps it has anger'd you, how justly, let the reader judge, and let the writer answer for himself, if alive) if you did not read it, how did you know this? but if you did read it, you might have seen that the manuscript was still preserved in the hands of the publishers at Edinburgh, and was exposed to the view of all that desired it, if they suspected any word or sentence to be vitiate. Likewise a considerable time ago, when I heard that you was pretty confident that it was vitiate, particularly upon the xiii. chapter, you thought the stile was not like the rest; I sent you word that I should show the manuscript, as sufficient to satisfy any man that was willing to be satisfied; as no man in this age was able to counterfeit the author's write undiscern-
ed:

ed: and as the manuscript is now in my custody, I yet offer the same. Now, Sir, what an odious and injurious imputation is hereby cast upon all who had it in their custody, or were concerned in its publication, especially the Printer, who could not but see if it had been any way vitiate? And I must do the printer this justice, to bear witness, that he hath acted both a careful and faithful part, and deserves to be both commended and encouraged, altho' you do neither. The truth is, Sir, I believe you would rather seem to lay the blame of all the following mistakes any where, rather than upon the worthy author, who has been deservedly famous in the churches of Christ, these hundred years past, both at home and abroad, for singular abilities, extensive learning, and eminent piety and orthodoxy. And you have but reason to suspect, (yea, you may assure yourself of it) that it will be impossible for you to blast the reputation of either the venerable author, or his excellent book, among serious and orthodox readers.

“ 1st, (You say) In his introduction, he allows and
 “ very justly, that the reason why Jews and Gentiles
 “ could not be justified by the works of the law of
 “ Moses, was that they had not fulfilled the obligations of that law.”——

Sir, you must allow me to tell you, that some say, to stumble in the threshold is ominous; but here (if I mistake not) you stumble in the very entry, into a threefold mistake, even when you are going to correct mistakes, which I think is a presage that your undertaking shall not be happy. For 1st, if you read the preface, you might see that the introduction to the first vii. chapters was not his. 2. I can see no such thing in it. 3. Neither would it be just if it were. It is true, the Gentiles were inexcusable, and liable to the judgment of God, because they did not walk according to the dim light of the law written in their heart, the law of Moses they had not,—they knew not,—therefore would not be judged by it, *Rom. ii. 12.* The Jews, indeed, were more inexcusable thereby,
 and

and were under the curse of that law, because they did not *keep all the words thereof to do them*. But it is another thing to say, that it is the reason (which imports as much as if it was the only reason) why they could not be justified by that law. Now, by the *works of the law, no flesh can be justified*;—it ceases for ever to be a possible way of life to all the natural posterity of Adam ever since he fell, *Rom. iii. 20. Gal. ii. 16. Gal. iii. 11, 21, 22.* even supposing they did never actually break one command thereof; except you will suppose that they are not born sinners, under the guilt of Adam's first sin, and wanting original righteousness, and that they are not naturally corrupt, (which I think by the sequel is too apparent to be your opinion) the contrary of which, first and last, was his doctrine. Therefore, he did not (*as you say*) “forget this in his explication of chap. iii. 19—31. “where he places his argument upon a different “foot,—as if obedience to the laws of God, even “under the gospel, were of no avail,—contrary to “chap. vi. and viii.” Indeed, he teaches, that obedience to the laws of God, under both law and gospel is absolutely necessary to give evidence of the truth of faith; and that it necessarily flows from it, as good fruit natively grows on a good tree, and is an evidence that it is such; yet is no cause that it is a good tree, or of its fruitfulness: but he utterly denies good works of obedience to be causes of justification, either in whole or in part, because the inspired apostle leads him to it; and he asserts and proves justification to be only and wholly by the righteousness of Christ, laid hold upon by faith. And there is no more contradiction in this, to chapters vi. and viii. than there is contradiction betwixt justification and sanctification, the last of which sweetly flows from, and follows the first. Now, that (in defence of Mr Brown's book) I may not give you only my word, instead of proof, as you generally here do; and as I can scarcely find any scripture more fully and clearly confirming this truth, (*viz. justification by faith without the works* of

of the law,) nor any writer that more soundly, clearly, and pertinently expounds and applies the same, than he doth in these verses, betwixt the 19 and 31, which you have here marked; and as you have shewed your superlative skill in correcting, (I believe I should say, perverting) our translation; yea, all the translations have yet been in English, and I cannot pretend skill to vindicate the translation: And altho' I would willingly appeal to the larger and shorter catechisms, and many learned Anti-arminian, commonly called orthodox divines, who have been in Scotland, England, and elsewhere, this 200 years, especially in the last century; yet such, I see, you will despise as being followers and admirers of Augustine the monk. I say, considering all this, I shall refer you for proof to the Westminster Confession, which you yourself have subscribed, and according to which, I suppose, you have solemnly engaged to teach; and therefore you cannot refuse it as a subordinate standard; except you retract your subscription and engagement. See *Confession*, chap. vi. ¶ 3, 6. chap. vii. ¶ 3. chap. viii. ¶ 8. chap. x. ¶ 1. chap. xi. ¶ 1, 2, 3. chap. xvi. ¶ 2, 5, 7. chap. xix. ¶ 6. by all which, it appears, that Mr Brown is upon the same foot with the Confession.

But in your second, you are more particular, and shew both chapter and verse, (*viz.* chap. v. verse 18.) "In his explication of which, (you say) he contradicts himself, and in order to make good a favourite point, he artfully shifts the case in hand, and fights "with a man of straw."—Pray, Sir, where is the self contradiction. I cannot see it, and I believe none but yourself will. The apostle is there shewing, that as by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so, by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men, to justification of life. Upon which, Mr Brown having in the former verses cleared the doctrine of imputation; and also, in this same place immediately before, then he resumes, in short, that the strength of the apostle's argument

lieth here : As all sinners are liable to condemnation, so all righteous persons are to enjoy life.—Where it is plain, that by *righteous persons*, he means, such as were so by imputation ; for neither the scripture nor he acknowledge any meer man to be righteous in the sight of God, in order to enjoy life, by inherent righteousness.—Can this be the self-contradiction you see ? (Yes, and then Popery also.) Then he giveth several strong and weighty reasons to prove that the word *all* cannot be taken in an universal, but in a restrained sense, for all who are in Christ, to whom he is a head ; now, whether you mean this, or the foregoing point, concerning the imputation of Adam's sin, and of the righteousness of Christ to these whom they did represent ; it is true, that these are both favourite points, and very material. You say, " He artfully shifts the case in hand, and fights with a man of straw." Yea, Sir, he is arguing with men, I suppose, similar to yourself, and if you will needs have them to be men of straw ; be it so, I shall not contend ; only I deny, that he shifts the case, that both the apostle and he hath in hand ; and if you think that he doth not handle the doctrine of the imputation of Adam's sin, and of the righteousness of Christ, in so copious and scholastic a way as you would have him, you may see abundance of this in his book upon justification, particularly chap. viii. but indeed, I am jealous you are displeased that he handled it at all. — " Thus, (you say) the weak reader is betrayed." — Betrayed, Sir ! let us see if the Confession, even your own confession of faith, does not betray them as much ; in chap. iii. ¶ 6. chap. vi. ¶ 3. chap. viii. ¶ 8. chap. xi. ¶ 1, 2. with the scriptures quoted.

3dly, (you say) " Upon the first five chapters he applies the reasoning of the apostle to the present times."—Indeed, this error, I am informed, you very warily guarded your people against, when you was lecturing upon these chapters. But Sir, if the reasoning of the apostle in the first five chapters be unappliable to the present times ; why not the rest

of the epistle? yea, why not all the rest of the epistles? and if so, for what use are all these five chapters to us in these last ages? are they only to shew us what was once the state of Jews and Gentiles; and what the way of justification once was? If it may not be applied to the present times, it cannot shew us what our state by nature is; nor what the way of justification now is neither. Pray Sir, why, may it not be applied now? I know you answer, that then, they were without the pale of the church and covenant of God; and now they are born and brought up within it. Sir, I intend not to enter upon a formal dispute, nor will intended brevity allow a particular disquisition of this; I shall only say this in short. 1. I hope you will, (at least should) acknowledge, that *all scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable*,—and that these *holy men of God spake and wrote as they were moved by the Holy Ghost*; therefore the Holy Spirit inspiring the apostles, had a view to all after ages. 2. The unchangeable God being still the same, and all mankind being still the same by nature, and also the way of reconciliation and acceptance with God, being still the same, requires that the same frame and method of gospel doctrine be taught at all times also. 3. Altho' there be a visible external difference as to their federal state, betwixt such as are born and educate within the visible church, and those who are without, with respect to many external privileges, and ecclesiastic dignities, yet there is no difference as to saving interest in Christ, and acceptance with God, without regeneration, and a vital union with Christ by faith: as witnesseth the apostle, *Rom. iii. 9. Gal. iii. 22. Amos ix. 7.* and the corrupt depravity of church members witnesseth the same also. 4. If these first five chapters be not applicable to these who are within the covenant, and the pale of the Christian church, then they could not be applicable to the Romans, to whom this epistle was wrote, more than to us in this time; for they were already a church, *beloved of God, called to be saints, Rom. i. 7.*

and

and whose *faith was spoken of through the whole world*, verse 8. 5. To what purpose would the apostle have treated so largely of Abraham's justification by faith, chap. iv. to prove that believers under the New Testament were justified the same way; and at last concluded, verse 23. *That it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him for righteousness; but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe.*—And again, chap. xv. 4. he tells us. *that whatsoever was written aforetime, was written for our learning, that we through patience, and comfort of the scriptures, might have hope.*—And if what was written in the Old Testament, was also written for the sake of believers under the new; shall not what is written in the New Testament, as much, if not more, be written for our learning? 6. Mr Brown had the example of the apostles in many places, particularly *Heb. xiii. 5, 6.* where the apostle applies to believers in that time generally, the promise made to Joshua, chap. xv. *I will not leave thee, nor forsake thee;* which you (perhaps) would think was applicable only to Joshua. Nay, but you tell us, "That the apostle himself expressly confines it to the first ages, *iii. 26. "at this time,* says he." You now bring scripture for proof of what you say; but pray, Sir, did you ever see any man before yourself make such use of this place? or, is this fair quoting of scripture? is it not rather a gross perversion of scripture, thus to cut out three short words out of the middle of a verse? whereas, if you had quoted the whole verse, it would not have served your intent; and I think it is evident to any ordinary reader, that from the 21 verse to the end of the 26, is but one entire sentence, and these words (*at this time*) according to the scope of the apostle, respects the declaring of the righteousness of God at that time, by the setting forth of Christ to be a propitiation, as Mr Brown, the Dutch annotators, and others have clearly shewed; as also your own Confession, chap. vii. ¶ 6. chap. viii. ¶ 5. chap. xi. ¶ 6. bring these same verses for proof, that the way of justification under both

both the Old and New Testaments was the same, viz. By "the perfect obedience and sacrifice of our Lord Jesus Christ, whereby he made satisfaction to justice, and purchased not only reconciliation, but an everlasting inheritance in the kingdom of heaven, for all those whom the Father hath given him." But indeed, I believe you quoted this, because you could get no other, to prove such a strange point.

4thly, You say, "Tho' he sometimes takes notice of the original controversy upon which it was wrote (*Acts* xv. 1.) yet he generally loses sight of it in his comment." Sir, your own *ipse dixit* is no proof; where is there any evidence, or even probability, that this epistle was wrote upon what you call the original controversy, concerning circumcising the Gentiles? or where does Mr Brown take notice of it? Nay, your own Mr Whitby, (who, I suppose, you often follow, even he himself, tho' a professed Arminian) speaks more truly, in his preface to this epistle, page 2. where he says, that there is no ground to believe that this epistle was wrote upon any particular occasion.—But where runs he into the Antinomian plan? you say generally; if so, it would be easy to shew some particulars. I am far from favouring Antinomianism, and shall not deny that it is the worst of all mistakes. But Sir, you must allow me to tell you (since I have nothing here to do, till you shew more particular evidence) that it is too generally observable, that Arminians in principle, are commonly Antinomians in practice; for it is undeniably evident, that at all times when Arminian doctrine prevailed here in Scotland, viz. about 1624, a few years after the synod of Dort, where it was condemned, it began to be publicly vented and pled for by the bishops and their followers, till the year 1638. when Prelacy was cast out, and it along with it, until 1661, when Prelacy and Arminianism came in again: And at both these times, profanity and licentiousness of all sorts attended it, as the shadow doth the body: and since the Revolution, altho' there was part of that heaven remained lurking in many places, yet it was

appeared very publicly, till little more then forty or fifty years ago; since which time it has grown so fast, and spread so far, that almost the whole lump seems to be leavened with it: and altho' it hath been at different times, metamorphosed into different shapes, and assumed different features, and been cloathed in various dresses, yet substantially it is one and the same. And now, let an appeal be made to any sober and thinking person, who is advanced in years; if ungodliness and licentiousness of all sorts, has not since that time made prodigious advances; and if in every place where such doctrine hath been most and longest taught and received, there have not also been the greatest overflow of a deluge of impiety and unholiness. And altho' you here charge the pure doctrine of the gospel of the grace of God, as being a doctrine that tends to licentiousness; yet we know assuredly, that it had an epistle of commendation upon the hearts of many of the hearers, which might have been known and read of all men, in turning them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God; whereas you might see that all your exhortations to virtue, and dehortations from vice, only upon moral or legal motives, appear to be blasted and ineffectual. And no wonder, tho' the Lord in his holy and righteous judgment in an holy and permissive way, suffer that corruption which is in all men by nature, to break over all its banks, to shew his displeasure, by blasting such doctrine as tends natively to exalt proud man's free will in his election, justification, continuance in that state, and admission to glory; and consequentially, at least, to debase in so far the sovereign freedom of the free grace of God. I come now to your 5th mistake, where you say, " He almost always substitutes the terms of admission into the Christian covenant at that time, for the terms of acceptance to salvation under the gospel, and within the pale of the Christian church; and thus makes the apostle to contradict himself, chap. iii. 28. and vi. 22. and viii. 1.

Truly,

Truly, Sir, if you had remembered that the Romans to whom the apostle is writing, consisted partly of Jews and partly of Gentiles, and were already a church, as is clear from the above quoted, *Rom. i. 7, 8.* and therefore were admitted into the Christian covenant, and within the pale of the Christian church already: you might have supposed that it would have been impertinent for the apostle to spend so many chapters teaching them how they shall be admitted into a visible church state only. I grant that a profession of faith and obedience also, both then was, and yet is necessary for this end, (and I wish you and your brethren were more circumspect in this) but a temporary or historical faith, will procure admission into the visible church, tho' both are specifically different from true, saving or justifying faith, (as may be seen in the parable of the sower) which is peculiar to the elect, and worketh by love, purifying the heart; and which naturally and necessarily produceth sanctification, by drawing life and sap from Jesus Christ the true vine, for bringing forth the fruits of holiness. As for your charge against Mr Brown, that "he almost always substitutes faith, for the terms of acceptance to salvation under the gospel."—I own he doth so, and so doth Christ himself, *John vi. 47. Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth on me hath everlasting life;* and in *John iii. 15, 16.* and chap. *vi. 29, 40.* and chap. *ii. 25, 26.* and *xvii. 3.* and his harbinger John Baptist doth the same, *John iii. 36.* and also, his apostles in their sermons and epistles in many places; and the whole body of orthodox writers make faith to be the only terms, mean or instrument, through or by which, union with and an interest in Christ and the new covenant can be attained; and that the righteousness of Christ, or his obedience and satisfaction, is the only meritorious cause, purchasing and procuring acceptance with God and admission into a state of grace, and also into the state of glory: Now, if faith be not the terms of acceptance to salvation under the gospel, and within the pale of the Christian church,

then it must be their own good works of righteousness, which they have done, contrary to 2Tim. i. 19. and Titus. iii. 5, 6, 7. *Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us abundantly, through Jesus Christ our Saviour.*—Which is of eternal verity, and will still hold true of, and be applicable to all the redeemed both on earth and in heaven. And if the terms of their acceptance to salvation, be their own good works, either legal or evangelical; then believers in Christ must only by faith be admitted into a possibility of being saved, upon condition that they perform these terms; and so the new covenant shall be only a new edition of the old covenant of works, with a little abatement of its rigour. This, I know, is the path-way wherein Arminians run*.

But according to Mr Brown's doctrine, whosoever are united to Christ by faith, are also accepted in him, being cloathed with his righteousness, and made partakers of his Spirit, and thereby made more and more conformable to his likeness, both in his death and resurrection: and this he doth (not almost, but) always, without contradicting either himself or the apostle, or making the apostle to contradict himself, (as you falsely assert,) but he clearly through all his commentary, distinguisheth betwixt justification and sanc-

* If I should lean to my free will
or strength, I could not stand;
Oft had I perish'd, if my life
had lien in mine own hand.

I wonder not that such as lean
to their works, will, or strength,
Fit others fit, and make themselves
apostatize at length.

For such do not deny themselves,
and so, not follow thee.-----

How shall such souls not persevere,
and so be sav'd at length;
Whom thou dost empty of their own,
and fill'st with thy fresh strength.

Dickson's True Christian Love.

sanctification ; and shews, that by the first, a sinner is freely absolved from the guilt of sin, and accepted as righteous in the sight of God, for and through, the obedience and satisfaction of Jesus Christ alone. And by the last, *viz.* sanctification, the believer is renewed in the whole man, after the image of God, and enabled by his Spirit to make use of Christ by faith, for mortifying sin, and for grace and strength to walk in newness of life ; and by renewed or repeated acts of faith and repentance, they receive renewed remissions, until they are admitted into glory, upon the same terms upon which they were admitted into a state of favour and friendship with God, *viz.* only of free grace, through the perfect obedience and satisfaction of Jesus Christ imputed to them, and laid hold off, and rested upon by faith ; and at the same time he wisely and warily guardeth his reader against Antinomian and Libertine errors, by shewing the necessity of the study of holiness, and of confessing and professing the faith of Christ, by word and deed, ere they can attain to the end of their faith, the salvation of their soul ; and after the example of the apostle Peter, 2 Pet. i. 5, to verse 10. he frequently and earnestly exhorteth to *holiness*, and to *add to faith virtue*, and to *virtue knowledge*, and to *knowledge temperance*, and to *temperance patience*, and to *patience godliness*, and to *godliness brotherly kindness*, and to *brotherly kindness charity* :—and to *abound in these*,—that so they should *not be barren and unfruitful* :—that they should rather *give all diligence to make their calling and election sure*,—and that so, *an entrance should be ministered unto them abundantly, into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*. (And what he taught to others, he was eminently exemplary in, as is attested by these who were acquainted with him,) and in all this he fully agrees with the Confession of Faith, see chap. xi. ¶ 1. chap. xiii. ¶ 1. chap. xiv. ¶ 2. chap. xvi. ¶ 6.

6thly, In your sixth mistake, you come on very briskly, and say, “ In his explication of the vii. chap-

“ ter

“ter, he forgets the thread of the apostle’s reasoning, and follows the admirers of Augustine the monk.” Not so fast, Sir, if you please; for judicious and orthodox readers will see that he follows the thread of the apostle’s reasoning very accurately; and whereas you speak so opprobriously and disdainfully of Mr Brown, and Augustine also, and call him the Monk; I’ll tell you, Sir, Augustine wrote several books of confessions and retractions; I wish you would do the like, and then we should not call you S——r the Arminian, nor Sceptic neither. It would not be very handsome, when naming Paul, to call him Paul the Persecutor. It is known, that Augustine was among the best and greatest writers of his time, and a great opposer of Pelagius the grandfather of Arminians, (perhaps this is the ground of your prejudice) and is by them falsely asserted to be the first founder of the Calvinist system; whereas Mr Brown in his book upon justification shews the contrary. But I understand, that you are displeased with his large and judicious arguing against your friends the Pelagians, Socinians and Arminians, upon the 14 verse, where he proves by many strong arguments, that the apostle doth personate neither unconverted Jew nor Gentile, but that as he had shewed in the former verses, the state he was in while unregenerate; so he doth in the following part of the chapter, shew the sore battle betwixt the renewed part in him, and the unrenewed part; betwixt sin and grace, even when he was now in a regenerate state: and in his explication and doctrinal observations deduced therefrom, he very clearly shews the spiritual warfare, that all the saints, while in a militant state, must maintain and undergo, some more, some less; and whatever you think, I can confidently appeal to the experience of all who have ever got a view of the large extent and spiritual meaning of the holy law of God, as reaching the most inward thoughts, desires and inclinations of the heart; as the apostle saw it, verses 7, 9, 13. and of all who have ever had a discovery of the sinfulness of sin, in

C

the

the light of that holy law, and of the desperate wickedness and deceit of their own hearts; and in a word, of all who are seriously engaged in watching over, and contending against their spiritual enemies: I say, I appeal to all such, and only to such, if Mr Brown does not speak according to their experience, both in his explication and practical observations. And whereas you say, "He pays no regard to the explanations of the orthodox, and others of the church, for the first 400 years after Christ."—I shall not enquire curiously who you mean by the orthodox, or whom you mean by these others of the church, as I am unacquainted with those gentlemen; it satisfies me if I find an inspired writer speaking so plainly, both here, and *Gal. v. 17.* and all the orthodox (I mean Calvinist) divines of this, and other reformed churches, who have wrote this 200 years expounding it so; who were inferior to none of these who lived 13 or 1400 ago; and I think it should satisfy you also, as your subscribed confession brings always this same place of scripture for a proof of these same points, which Mr Brown draws from it. See in particular, chap. ix. ¶ 5. chap. xiii. ¶ 2, 3. You say, "In this he agrees with all the Popish commentators." I confess, I never read one of them, and therefore, know not how they expound it. I suppose, they are all in Latin which I understand not; and you must even allow me to doubt if this be so, since I know that they hold that some of their saints can yield perfect obedience to the law, yea and supererogate; but as this appears to be said at random, it is not to be wondered at, altho' it do not directly hit the truth; and tho' it should, truth is still truth, though it be in a Papist's mouth:—You add, "To this may be applied *Luke v. 33.*" Yea, Sir, but an error will never become a truth through age. But as I esteem the scripture above all human writers, so, if you will allow the writings of the prophets and apostles to be the old wine; I cheerfully own, that it is far, very far, better than the new, which you find in Photius,

Origen, Theophylact, Theodoret, and Oecumenius, as quoted by Dr Whitby; yea, I think, that your new wine is but water. And I suppose, the ground of your mistake is, that you do not advert to this, that as the more clearly the light shines into the house, the more the dust, atoms and filth are seen; so the more of the true light of the knowledge of God shines into the heart, and the greater measure of sanctification and nearness to God that is attained in this life, the more will such see of their own sinfulness and vile-ness, and the more will they loath themselves, as holy David in many places of the psalms, particularly *Psal.* xxv. 11. xxxviii. 5, 9, 17, 18. xl. 12. cxxx. 3. cxliii. 2. and count their own righteousness to be but as filthy rags, with *Isaiah*, chap. lxiv. 6, 7. and the further they will be from expecting either justification, continuance in that state, or an entrance into glory, upon account of their own obedience, whether legal or evangelical; and the more will they see their obligations to the free grace of God in Jesus Christ for all; for instance, hear holy *Isaiah*, chap. vi. 5. saying, *Wo's me, for I am undone, because I am a man of unclean lips:—For mine eyes have seen the King, the Lord of Hosts.* And *Job*, chap. xlii. 5, 6. says, *But now mine eyes have seen thee; wherefore I abhor myself, and repent in dust and ashes.* And chap. ix. 2, 3. And that holy man, Paul says, that touching the righteousness which is in the law, he was blameless; *Phil.* iii. 7, 8, 9. *But what things were gain to me, those I counted loss for Christ; yea, doubtless, and I count all things but loss, for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord; for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung, that I may win Christ, and be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith.* And this vii. chapter to the Romans is a pregnant evidence, (whatever you say to the contrary) that he had a more clear discovery of sin in himself, and more wrestling against it, and more groaning under it, than most of the saints

we read of in scripture. See also, 1 Tim. i. 15. i John i. 8, 9, 10. But let a proud self-conceited, self-righteous Pharisee boast himself ever so much of his negative holiness, fasting, and alms; he is far from holiness, and as from salvation: I say not this, as if holiness and obedience to the laws of God were of no avail; for it is of such absolute necessity, that without it, *none shall see the Lord*; and whoever make it not their chiefest study to glorify God, by a holy conversation, it is evident, that they were never united to Christ by faith; were never justified, and are not partakers of the saving operations of his Spirit: for to whom he is made *wisdom and righteousness*, he is also made *sanctification and redemption*.

7thly, In your seventh mistake you say, "He makes
 " no distinction betwixt the purpose or predestination
 " of God, to call the Gentiles into the Christian
 " church, and their actual election at their acceptance
 " of the call, stiled the election of grace, in oppo-
 " sition to the old election of the Israelites, who were
 " chosen and beloved for their father's sake." Sir,
 I am jealous you have not read the book, at least with proper attention, which brings to my mind what the kingly preacher says, *He that answereth a matter before he hear it, it is folly and shame to him*. If you read him upon chap. xi. 16. and forward, you may see him make a clear distinction betwixt the Lord's choosing some nations, and not others, wherein he sets up a church and ordinances, to be visible churches; and his choosing particular persons to everlasting life, and not others who enjoy the same external privileges. But I do not think that he either knew or acknowledged what you call actual election, neither doth the scriptures of the Old or New Testament, or our Confession of Faith know it; perhaps, it is a rag or relict of old Pelagius's. But according to Mr Brown, election of grace, or free and gracious election, is of a much older date, even as old as eternity itself: For he holds that there is none of the Lord's purposes or decrees have had a beginning within time, and there-fore

fore, that they will never be revoked or recalled, but will stand unchangeably, having no other cause but the good pleasure of his will. And in this he perfectly agrees with the Confession; see chap. iii. throughour, and chap. xxv. ¶. 2. But here, that you may agree with the Arminians, in denying particular election of particular persons, you run into a greater mistake than Dr Whitby himself upon chap. xi. 28. for by the scope of the apostle, it evidently appears, that by the *remnant according to the election of grace*, is meant a remnant among the Jews, who being chosen and ordained to everlasting life, believed; and is not spoken of the Gentiles, (as you here say) else you would make the inspired apostle himself, to forget the objection to which he is there answering. You say, "That it is *stiled* the election of grace, in opposition to the old election of the Israelites, who were chosen and beloved for their fathers sakes." This seems to insinuate that the old election of the Israelites was not of grace, (so the words *in opposition* will import) contrary to *Deut.* vii. 6, 8. Here you mostly make use of the words of the apostle, chap. xi. 28. but wrong his sense, who is there treating of the future calling of the Jews, and says they *are* beloved for *the fathers sake*, viz. for the sake of the covenant made with their ancestors, according to *Lev.* xxvi. 42, 45. as the Dutch annotators and Mr Brown have shewn.

But as this appears to be an introduction to your next; I come to your eight mistake, and a great mistake it is, if it be indeed one.

8thly, "Therefore (you say) he applies to individuals, what is designed by the apostle of large bodies and societies of men, chap. viii. 29. and chapters ix. x. and xi.—Sir, I truly think it is a great pity that you did not read him with more attention, before you had told us how he applies these chapters: for part of the ix. the x. generally, and especially the xi.-chapter, treats of the rejection of the Jews, and the calling of the Gentiles, and the re-inchurching again of the Jews; and is by him so expounded and

applied, as any reader may see ; but that the viii. chap. ver. 29, 30,—&c. is applicable to individuals, I know of none who deny it, except Pelagians, Arminians, Socinians, and their fraternity. And in the ix. chapter, upon the 10, 11, 12, 13. verses, he gives a good number of more strong and irrefragable arguments, than you will be able to answer in haste, to prove that the apostle is there treating of particular election. But Sir, I see that you have a good will to overthrow eternal election of particular persons, and if you can pervert, and explain away the native sense of the apostle's reasoning in this place, you will give a great evidence that you will make a shift to do it in other places also ; since this purpose is more largely and fully treated of here, than in any other place of scripture : and, if you can overthrow eternal predestination of particular persons, the other four links of Arminian doctrine will necessarily follow ; for if there be no particular election, what shall make a difference betwixt one man and another, but Lord Freewill ? and if it be of freewill, then efficacious grace must be denied, and universal or conditional redemption must be asserted, and also the saints falling from grace ;—which you have pretty plainly in your next : where we see, that justification with you, is only the remission of past sins, and being received into the church and covenant of God upon the gospel plan :—And so the new covenant is only a new edition of the old covenant of works *. But now, if these things were
so,

* Now, who say that thy elect ones,
for all this, perish may ;
And that thy saints of purpose call'd,
from thee may fall away.

And looses us from building on
the strength of thy right hand ;
They draw from building on the rock,
and bid us build on sand.

They say, Peter and Judas are
alike belov'd of thee,
And that they both for gifts receiv'd
alike beholden be.

so, it cannot be said, that the *everlasting covenant* is well ordered in all things and sure, 2 Sam. xxiii. nor that the Lord's covenant shall stand fast, Psal. lxxxix. 28—34 nor shall that hold true, that *he that believeth on the Son, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation*, John iii. 36. nor shall it be a truth, that *all that the Father giveth to Christ shall come to him, and he that cometh, he will in no wise cast out*, John vi. 37—40. nor can it be said, *Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us*, Tit. iii. 5. nor that *the foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, The Lord knoweth them that are his*, 2 Tim. ii. 19. All these, and many more, are the absurd consequences of this plan; and directly repugnant, not only to the 17th article of

As Judas, for his perishing,
may wyte the love of self;
So Peter, his free-will for life,
may praise and thank himself.----

They say, thou chooseth some to day
and casteth them off the morn:

They make thee like vain men to be,
and do thy counsel scorn.-----

Thy word, thy oath, thy covenant,
they make no certainty;

Faith's anchor they make drive, they speak
in substance blasphemy.

They make the merchant nothing wise,
and very short of thought,

Who pay'd the price, and was not sure
to have what thou had bought.

Yea, so unwise, as for thy sheep,
thine own life not to spare;

Whom thou may lose, tho' so dear bought:
such foolish blocks are rare.

O wicked thought, be far from me;
I know thy love doth last;

And whom of purpose thou dost call,
thy grace doth hold them fast.

Whom thou dost love, for them thou dy'd;
for whom thou dy'd, they live;

Thy love, thy ransoming, and heav'n
all jointly thou dost give.-----

of the church of England, the old Scots or Geneva Confession, the Palatine Catechism, Calvin's Catechism, our own excellent Catechism, with Flavel's, Allein's, and Vincent's explications, and all the Calvinist divines at home and abroad (which I do not wonder at, seeing they are such as you call admirers of Augustine the Monk.) But it is surprizing to see you quarrelling Mr Brown for applying and explaining this place of scripture the same way, and drawing the same doctrines from it, which your own subscribed Confession so often and so clearly assert, and prove thereby. Need I quote the places? I can scarce think it, there are so many; yet I shall quote a few. See chap. iii. throughout, chap. x. ¶ 1, 4. chap. xi. ¶ 3, 4. chap. xvii. ¶ 1, 2, 3. By all which it is evident that you are giving a home-thrust at your own confession, under the mask of Mr Brown's cloak, as in your next, you do at our English Bible.

othly, You say, he takes no notice that the word translated " Righteousness and justification, in the " original is the same, and therefore leads the English " reader into a gross mistake through the iiii, ivth, and vth chapters."—Strange, Sir! and doth our bible lead us into a gross mistake! and that in a point so material? yea, and all other translations that have yet been in English; Tindal's and Coverdale's translation, Beza's and the Dutch translations, agree in this with our own. Sir, I cannot pretend skill in the Greek tongue, therefore, perhaps you'll laugh, or be offended, if I, a poor weak, ignorant, unlearned weaver, who never had priviledge to be at any school shall meddle with this: but yet I have seen Mr Brown's book upon justification where he takes notice of this, and shows that the word δικαιοσυνη in its native signification is *Just*, Right, law: yea your own Dr Whitby frequently owns as much; altho' he teaches you to read it justification, that he may with more facility enable you to deny justification to be by the imputation of the righteousness of Christ.—But as Mr. Brown hath shewed in the foresaid book, this will serve you

in little stead : (I have not time to transcribe, but you may easily procure the book itself) where with great perspicuity and strength of argument from scripture he shews, that justification is not the same with righteousness, nor yet with pardon of sin, but supposes both ; as the inviolable justice of the law, and our sinful, wretched, and miserable condition required both a satisfaction for our sins, and a righteousness imputed to us, who had none of our own ; before we could be justified in the sight of a holy God, whose judgment is always according to truth, and will acquit and justify no man till the δικαιοσύνη the *right* and demand of the law be fulfilled or satisfied—will account none righteous who are not truly so, either inherently, or by imputation ; the first no meer man ever was, therefore it must be by imputation ; so that the obedience and satisfaction of Christ as the meritorious cause, and faith as an instrument laying hold thereon for remission of sin, altho' distinct things from justification, yet are inseparable from it ; and here your separating the building from the foundation I fear shall make your superstructure to be without a foundation, or upon a sandy one.

But you tell us, “ In fact it was justification itself, “ which consisted in the remission of their past sins, “ and their being received into the church and covenant “ of God, upon the gospel plan.” Sir, what your plan is, I cannot directly say ; I know Arminians seldom agree in every point of their plan ; but Dr Whitby's plan (who I observe you often follow) is, that there is no imputation of Adam's first sin to his posterity, only they are thereby subjected to temporal death, made mortal ; and no imputation of the righteousness of Christ neither ;—that there is an indefinite conditional election of whosoever believes ;—that Christ died indefinitely for all such as shall believe ;—that this faith is nothing else but a firm assent to this truth, that Jesus Christ is the son of God,—the Saviour of sinners : that this act of faith itself, and not its object, is imputed for righteousness ;—that whoever have this faith are justified, that is, obtain the pardon of their

past sins;—and if they continue in this faith, and obey the precepts of the gospel, they will be finally justified at death; and if not, they will fall from their justified state into condemnation.—Now, so far as I can understand, this is your plan, or at least near it; (and if you break his thread, I'm jealous you shall make worse work than he) as also, of your other favourite authors Bishop Hoadly, Dr Clark, &c. and how inconsistent this plan is with, and repugnant unto, the true method of grace, and the whole frame and contexture of the everlasting covenant, any who are not blinded by a spirit of error, may see from these scriptures; Isa. liii. 10, 11. Isa. liv. 10. Isa. lix. 21. Jer. xxiv. 7. xxx. 22. xxxi. 33. xxxii. 38, 39, 40. Ezek. xi. 19, 20. xxxvi. 26, 27, 31, 32. John i. 12, 13. iii. 14, 15, 16,—36. vi. 37.—44. x. 9, 26, 27, 28, 29. Eph. i. 4, 5, 11, 12, 13, 14. ii. 1, 2, 3, 8, 9. Heb. viii. 10. and many more. And as this plan is contrary to scripture, so also it hath been fully refuted by a great number of orthodox divines; I shall name a few, viz. Messrs Dickson, Durham, Rutherford, Gillespie, Brown, Binning, Nevay, Flavel, Owen, Ball, Bulkley, Burges, &c. I know you will readily say, that all these were followers of Augustine the Monk, and I shall not deny it, as it was impossible for them to go before him, who lived more than a thousand years after him; and how contrary it is to the Confession of Faith, may be seen by the places already quoted in the iii. vi. viii. x. xi. xiii. xiv. xvi. and xvii. chapters.

You add, “ There is only one exception from “ this, chap. v. 18.—where the antithesis determines the sense”. But Sir, I think it is owing to your perverting the sense that the scope of the apostle doth not as evidently determine the sense in other places also. Learned Dr Whitby finds more exceptions, viz. chap. i. 17. and ix. 30. in both which places he grants, that *δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ* signifies the righteousness of God, or according to him, the righteousness of faith (which is really the same, for true faith knoweth no other righteousness in order to justification but Christs) and chap.

chap. iii. 26. he owns the same and chap. ii. 26. he saith that δικαιοματια τῷ νομῷ is *righteousness or ordinances of the law*—that the word δικαιοματια is used sometimes for the divine judgments, which being always done in equity, and according to the deserts of men, are fitly called δικαιοματια, or *righteous judgments*;—and sometimes the moral precepts of the law, as when the apostle saith, τὸ δικαιομα τῷ νομῷ, *the righteousness of the law*. By which confession from an adversary, I see the truth of what Mr. Brown saith; and that if it were not to shut out the imputed righteousness of Christ from being the cause of justification, you would not have loaded the learned translators with leading the English reader into a gross mistake. And, Sir, I must tell you, that your ordinary quarreling of our English bible is not good; it being a ready way to create in your unlearned auditors, a misregard and suspicion of every part of it; whereas the divinely inspired apostle when quoting scripture, generally follows the septuagint version, even when not fully corresponding with the Hebrew, lest he should cause them to stumble who had no other version: and if he who was infallibly guided in the right understanding of both languages did so, much more ought you who can pretend no such thing.

10thly, (you say) “Upon account of all which mistakes he raises observations from many passages which are quite foreign to the apostle’s meaning.” Truly, Sir, if all the former and the next, be mistakes or errors, (as they must be, if real, altho’ you are pleased to call them by the soft name of mistakes) I cannot see how any of them can be agreeable to the apostle’s meaning, as his doctrinal observations are evidently drawn from the text according to his explication thereof, except it be, as you say, only by accident, that is, beside his design. But you add, “And in some places scarcely consistent with the faith and doctrines of the gospel once delivered to the saints.” If you had said, not at all consistent with the faith and doctrines once delivered by Pelagius, Arminius, and their fraternity, such as bishop Hoadly, Dr Clark, Mofs, and the authors of
the

the late Illustration, you would have said truth. But, Sir, let me seriously ask you, Are they not consistent with, and fully agreeable to the faith and doctrines of the gospel, briefly summed up in your Confession of Faith, (I would say the Catechisms also, altho' I have not referred to them, lest you should refuse them, as not having subscribed them) and if Mr. Brown's exposition, and doctrinal observations both, be not agreeable to the Confession; I wish you had, or would yet, if you can, shew wherein he differs. And if he fully agrees with it in all the points wherein you condemn him, (as it is evident he doth) I pray you how could you subscribe if yourself, or how can you require others to subscribe it? and how can you take parents engaged to educate their children according to it, without gross dissimulation and prevaricating equivocation? or how could you consent to the late act of your synod at Air against dissimulation in subscribing it? Let me tell you, Sir, it is commonly reported your conduct at Air was not good; and I must say, the whole affair was conducted more by the rules of carnal policy, in favour of error and false teachers, than by the rules Christ hath laid down in his word for purging out both; and as Mr Fergusson was not so much as brought to a legal trial, more tenderness and respect was shewn to him than to Christ, the truth of the gospel, and salvation of souls.

In your 11th and last great mistake, which comprehends all the former, you say, " In short, the whole " commentary is not upon the original plan of the " gospel, as preached by St. Paul to the Gentiles." Sir, I have told you already that the Romans to whom Paul is writing, consisted partly of Jews and partly of Gentiles; although it is evident from chap. i. 13. and xi. 13. that the greatest part of them were Gentiles: so that I see not how you can evite charging a fault upon the apostle himself, for writing this epistle upon such a plan to them; if indeed he preached and wrote upon one plan to the Jews, and upon another to the Gentiles; which is yet unproven, and I believe ever will; since he himself says, Acts xx. 21. that he had

testi-

testified both to the Jews and Greeks, repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ. See also Acts xxvi. 20. Rom. iii. 29, 30. 1 Cor. i. 23, 24. Gal. iii. 28. I conclude therefore, that as both Jews and Gentiles were under sin, and obnoxious to wrath; so the apostle preached one gospel, one way of justification, and the absolute necessity of holiness to both Jews and Gentiles; and except you can prove that the apostle preached and wrote upon one plan to the Jews, and upon another to the Gentiles, you here charge Mr Brown with teaching a false gospel,—another gospel than the apostle Paul taught, and consequently, that not only he, but the compilers of the Confession of Faith, and the whole body of our former worthy orthodox divines (with whom he fully agrees) must have come under that awful anathema, Gal. i. 6, 7, 8. which that you may the better judge whether it be most applicable to them, or to yourself, I shall transcribe a little of what the Dutch annotators say upon the place; ver. 6. *Unto another gospel*, [that is, unto another doctrine of salvation; which the seducers indeed call the gospel, but is not the right gospel, and differs far from that which we have preached unto you.] Ver. 7. *But there are some who trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ*, [that is, falsify it, make it vain or of none effect; namely some, who from the sect of the pharisees having betaken themselves to the Christian religion, sought to mingle the law with the gospel, and the righteousness of works with the righteousness of faith.] Ver. 8. *But tho' we, or an angel out of heaven should preach any other gospel unto you, than that ye have received*, [i. e. not only contrary to the same, but also, that add any thing to it beside that which we have preached; which the false apostles did, teaching that men are not justified by faith alone, but also by the works of the law,] *let him be accursed*, Greek *anathema*. I pray you Sir, take heed to this, and look back to your 1st and 5th mistakes.

You say that Paul received his commission in the interest of the Gentiles, and warmly espouses their cause.—True; and it is likewise true he received his commission

tion to the Jews also, as appears by *Acts* ix. 15. xxvi. 17, 20. and he as warmly sought their salvation, *Rom.* ix. 1, 2, 3. and in every place to which he went, where Jews were, he preached the gospel first to them, *Acts* xiii. 5, 14, 46. xiv. 1. xvii. 2, 10. and xxvi. 20.

You next set down a number of large quotations of scripture in the place where proofs should be, but I know not to what purpose; I think it is a great difficulty to know what it is you would prove by them, so that one would almost be tempted to think that you have done it at random, without reading the contents, particularly *Gal.* iii. 14—29. (which tho' a large quotation, yet you begin at the middle of a sentence) the scope of the whole chapter being a strong and clear confirmation of the doctrine you have been here opposing, especially verses 10, 11, 12, 13, 21, 22, 28, 29. so that I think you could hardly have found a chapter more repugnant to yourself. *Eph.* iii. 1—11. and *Col.* i. 21—28. prove indeed, that the apostle Paul was in a peculiar way the apostle of the Gentiles, but who doubts or denies this? *2 Tim.* ii. 9. 10. will not prove that all the sufferings which he endured, was for the sake of the Gentiles alone; except you can prove that by the word (elect) he means the Gentiles alone, exclusive of the elect among the Jews.

But as I have neither time nor qualifications suitable for writing (and I know Sir, you will not expect accuracy or method from a man of my station and education, and perhaps you are also weary of reading) I shall conclude. Only you'll allow me upon the whole of your accusation, to observe, 1. What a vain and unsuccessful attempt it is, to fight against the truths and servants of God; and that as the great and now glorified Mr John Brown, was a singularly diligent and faithful servant to his Lord and Master, while he lived, and regarded not his own life, to supply the sake of other men's service; so his gracious and ever-faithful Lord, not only while he lived, but even yet, so long after his death, hath kept and performed to him that pleasant promise, *Isa.* liv. 17. No

weapon formed against thee shall prosper, and every tongue that shall rise against thee in judgment thou shalt condemn: This is the heritage of the servants of the Lord, and their righteousness [judgment or defence, Dutch annot.] is of me saith the Lord. And also,

2. I observe, that the great mistake, upon which many of your other mistakes seem to be founded, is, that the gospel method of election, justification, sanctification, and perseverance unto salvation, followed by Mr Brown, and all who have hitherto been called orthodox; is a doctrine that tends to encourage idleness and licentiousness; and that your plan tends to encourage diligence and holiness: and by these good words and fair speeches you deceive the simple; whereas the contrary hath been so clearly shewed by many worthy divines, that it would be idle and arrogant for me to pretend to do it so well, particularly Mr Brown upon *Rom. viii.* in his book upon justification, and in his book intitled, *Christ the Way, the Truth and the Life*; Mr Guthrie's *Christian's Great Interest*; Mr Binning in his *Common Principles of Religion*, and upon *Rom. viii.* and upon *1 John i.* Durham on *Isaiah. liii.* Mr Gray in his sermons on assurance, &c. Flavel's *Method of Grace*, &c. And in fact, you might observe, if experience doth not confirm the truth in this matter, as I hinted before upon your 4th mistake. See also the Confession, chap. xviii. ¶ 3, 4. chap. xix. ¶ 6, 7. 3. As by the whole, it is too evident, that you are apostatized from the sworn unto, and established doctrine of the church of Scotland, summarily contained in her excellent Confession of Faith and Catechisms; which hath been believed and taught with success, and a blessing from heaven, and sealed by the dying testimonies of a great cloud of witnesses; so you have rendered it indispensibly necessary for all such, as would hold fast the faith once delivered to the saints, to beware of, and avoid such doctrines and teachers, as they would give obedience to these scripture precepts, *Isa. viii. 20. Prov. xix. 27. Mat. xv. 14. Rom. xvi. 17. 1 Tim. vi. 3—5. 2 Tim.*

ii 16, 17. 2 *John* 10, 11. And truly, Sir, I think it greatly concerns you to read and seriously consider *Jer.* xxiii. 1, 2, 21, 22, 31, 32. For my part, altho' I esteem the purely preached gospel, and gospel ordinances, to be the greatest external mercy and privilege in this world, and the chiefest means of convincing and converting sinners, and of building up believers in comfort and holiness, through faith unto salvation; yet I see still more and more cause to bless the Lord that he hath hitherto kepted me from partaking with, or countenancing the administrations of such men.

Sir, perhaps you will think that I have been more free and plain, than is consistent with good manners, especially when I was writing to a man so far superior to me in learning and abilities. True, Sir, perhaps it may be so; but if you will be pleased to take this for an apology, I had your mistakes very often in mine eye as a copy; and I thought I was still more blameless than you, in as much as I was marking the mistakes of a living man; whereas you was laying great mistakes to the charge of a man far superior to yourself, in many (I had almost said all) respects, and who is dead long ago, and therefore in an utter incapacity to answer for himself. As for my mistakes in grammar, I know you will not quarrel such; for I freely confess I never learn'd it; and if you weary of its length, you know a weak unlearned man cannot be concise and comprehensive; some repetitions there may indeed be, as I had seldom leisure at one time to write one page; and I myself regrette, that such a worthy author and his book, had so weak an advocate; but truth is strong itself, and needs not such an able advocate as error, and perhaps some other may vindicate it to better purpose. However, I am assuredly persuaded, that truth, even these same truths which you here quarrel and condemn, will prevail at last against all opposers whomsoever.

I sincerely wish, you may quickly receive better light, and a more sound judgment in matters of such great importance, in which, I am, Sir,

your real well-wisher, R. I.

